UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,824	07/25/2003	Genady Grabarnik	YOR920030326US1	3765

7590 08/03/2006

Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560

EXAMINER	
SEYE, ABDOU K	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/627,824	GRABARNIK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Abdou Karim Seye	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *03* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 July 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 July 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/10/2003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is the initial office action based on the application filed on July 25, 2003.

Claims 1-23 are currently pending and have been considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter that the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 19, 20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Appropriate clarification is required on the following claims:

Claims 19, 20 and 22 recite the limitation "the operation". There is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation in these claims.

Claim 22 recites the limitation " the machine ". There is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation in this claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-7, 13-20 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Graham, et al. (US 6411974).**

Claim 1: Graham discloses a method of constructing one or more message parsing rules in accordance with a user and a machine, comprising the steps of:

a. Obtaining message data (fig. 2/202, col. 5, lines 35-43); and

b. Generating one or more message parsing rules (fig. 2/210, col. 5, lines 45-67).

Claim 2: Graham discloses a method of constructing one or more message parsing rules in accordance with a user and a machine as in claim 1 above and further discloses that the messages are associated with one of a network, an application and a system being analyzed (fig. 2, col. 6, lines 24-34) .

Claim 3: Graham discloses a method of constructing one or more message parsing rules in accordance with a user and a machine as in claim 2 above and further discloses that the message data is obtained by at least one of:

a. Reading messages logs (col. 3, lines 37-65); and

b. Message data in existing data storage (fig. 2/16, col. 5, lines 20-33).

Claim 4: Graham discloses a method of constructing one or more message parsing rules in accordance with a user and a machine as in claim 1 above and further discloses that the rule-based parsing system comprises a message adaptation system (fig. 2, col. 6, lines 29-35).

Claim 5: Graham discloses a method of constructing one or more message

parsing rules in accordance with a user and a machine as in claim 1 above and further discloses the step of establishing a message structure prior to generating parsing rules (fig. 2, col. 5, lines 34-64).

Claim 6: Graham discloses a method of constructing one or more message parsing rules in accordance with a user and a machine as in claim 1 above and further discloses the steps of establishing a message structure comprising of:

a. Creating a message skeleton (fig 3/300, col. 6, line 36 53);

b. Matching the one or more rule templates against the message skeleton (fig. 3, col. 6, lines 55-65); and

c. Providing potential matches to the user for validation and choice of a proper message structure (fig. 3, col. 6, lines 55-67).

Claim 7: Graham discloses a method of constructing one or more message parsing rules in accordance with a user and a machine as in claim 6 above and further discloses that templates are built for supporting the creation of the message structure (fig. 2/204/206/208, col. 5, lines 35-43).

Claim 13: Graham discloses a method of constructing one or more message parsing rules in accordance with a user and a machine as in claim 1 above and further discloses that the generated parsing rules comprises a set of parse rules associated with a message; textual stream (fig. 2/210, col. 5, lines 34- 54).

Claim 14: Graham discloses a method of constructing one or more message

parsing rules in accordance with a user and a machine as in claim 1 above and further discloses that the generated parsing rules comprises a transformation rule of a message (fig. 2/226, col. 6, lines 25-35).

Claim 15: Graham discloses a method of constructing one or more message parsing rules in accordance with a user and a machine as in claim 14 above and further discloses that the transformation rule comprises a string constant, selecting desired fields during extraction (fig. 3/314, lines 50-58).

Claim 16: Graham discloses a method of constructing one or more message parsing rules in accordance with a user and a machine as in claim 14 above and further discloses that the transformation rule comprises a permutation of the fields extracted(fig. 5, col. 11, lines 5-42).

Claim 17: Graham discloses an apparatus for constructing one or more message parsing rules, comprising:

a. A memory (fig.1/20 and 18, col. 4, lines 18-20); and

b. A processor (fig 1/12, col. 4, col. 4, lines 11-15).

Claim 18: Graham discloses an apparatus for constructing one or more message parsing rules as in claim 17 above and further discloses that the rule-based parsing system comprises a message adaptation system (fig. 1/28,26 and 12, col. 5, lines 10-19).

Claim 19: Graham discloses an apparatus for constructing one or more message parsing rules as in claim 1 above and further discloses that the processor is further

operative to establish a message structure; textual stream prior to the generating operation; parsing rules (fig. 3, col. 6, lines 36-67).

Claim 20: Graham discloses an apparatus for constructing one or more message parsing rules as in claim 19 above and further discloses that the operation of establishing a message structure comprises:

a. Creating a message skeleton (fig 3/300, col. 6, line 36 53);

b. Matching the one or more rule templates against the message skeleton (fig 3, col. 6, lines 55-65); and

c. Providing potential matches to the user for validation and choice of a proper message structure (fig. 3, col. 6, lines 55-67).

Claim 23: Graham discloses an article of manufacture for constructing one or more message parsing rules in accordance with a user and a machine, comprising a machine readable medium containing one or more programs which when executed implement the steps of:

a. Obtaining message data (fig. 4/400, col. 9, lines 1-8); and

b. Generating one or more message parsing rules (fig. 4/408, col. 9, lines 19-28).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole

> would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 8-12, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over **Graham et al. (US 6411974)** in view of **Sato et al. (US 6014680).**

Claims 8, 10, 21: Graham discloses a method of constructing one or more message parsing rules in accordance with a user and a machine as in claims 1, 5, 6, 7 and 17 above, but does not explicitly disclose a success or failure of a parsing document (positive or negative examples). In the same field of endeavor, Sato discloses a keyword/text model that succeeded or failed at parsing a document and a data type definition for correcting a failed parsing module (fig. 1/104,107, col. 9, lines 45-59). Therefore it would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to store positive and negative examples into a database table. One would have been motivated to store all successes and failures of a parsing document as positive and negative examples into a database in order to allow a user to have access to template samples. User can select desired template as a sample for generating a document structure instead of creating a new one. Therefore effectively minimizing the duration of the analyzing and designing phase when generating a document based on message parsing.

Claims11 and 22: Graham discloses a method of constructing one or more message parsing rules in accordance with a user and a machine as in claims 10 and 21 above, but does not explicitly disclose the machine parsing the message data

sequentially; catching errors for an unparseable message and creating candidate rules for parsing. In the same field of endeavor, Sato discloses a process that sequentially reads a document type starting from the opening and uses the parsing rule generating module to write into an output file only on a success/failure (fig. 19, col. 11, lines 1-67). Therefore, it would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to sequentially read character strings generated by a word processor, generate keyword extraction rules from a module, extract keywords from the word document in accordance with the keyword extraction rules and write the extracted data into an output file for a success/ failure. One would have been motivated to sequentially read a message, generate parsing rules from a module and display unparseable error messages in order to simplify the parsing process and to protect the data integrity. Therefore one can parse a non-structure document faster with fewer errors made when designing, analyzing, and creating a document structure.

Claim 9: Graham discloses a method of constructing one or more message parsing rules in accordance with a user and a machine as in claim 6 above, but does not explicitly disclose a message skeleton comprised of keyword names such as message start, end and a separator between fields. In the same field of endeavor, Sato et al. clearly shows and discloses a message start, end and separators between fields (fig. 6, col. 9, lines 5-18). Therefore, it would be obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a message start, end, and separators within the message skeleton information in order to improve readability of a message structure. One would have been motivated to add a message start, end, and a

separator within the message skeleton in order to make each component of the document layout easy to read for generating a document structure. Therefore one can improve the readability of a design text-based document by including keywords such as Start, End and Space within the document layout.

Claim 12: Graham discloses a method of constructing one or more message parsing rules in accordance with a user and a machine as in claim 11 above, but does not explicitly disclose the machine revising candidate rules based on feedback from the user. In the same field of endeavor, Sito discloses a correcting module and a rule conversion regulation for revising the candidate rules (fig.1/107, 112, col. 10, lines 1-67). Therefore, it would be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include an error correction module into the machine for revising candidate rules based on feedback from a user. One would have been motivated to handle error messages from a parsing failure based on feedback from a user in order to make a document processing system more efficient.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Levonai et al. (20040025173) discloses an interaction abstraction system and method.

Cummins at al. (5963943) discloses a system and a method for storing and retrieving performance and topology information.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Exr. Abdou Seye whose telephone number is (571) 270-1062. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James W. Myhre whose telephone number is (571) 272-6722. The fax phone number for Formal or Official faxes to Technology Center 3600 is (571) 273-8300. Draft or Informal faxes, which will not be entered in the application, may be submitted directly to the examiner at (571) 273-6722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3600.

AKS
July 24, 2006

James W. Myhre
Supervisory Patent Examiner